

In the Drawings

Figures 1a-d and 2a-b have been amended by adding the legend "Prior Art" thereto.

Figure 8b has been amended by replacing the reference numeral "292" with -- 293 --.

Remarks

Figures 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 2b, and 8b have been amended as requested by the Examiner. Specifically, Figures 1a-d and 2a, b have been amended to designate such figures as "prior art". In addition, Figure 8b has been amended to include reference no. 293, which is identified in the specification at page 23, line 12 in referring to the fins of the centre pin head 230. No new matter has been entered into the drawings as a result of these amendments. As such, the objections to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The abstract has been amended as requested by the Examiner to remove the legal phraseology "comprising" and "comprises". Moreover, the last line reciting "Figure 7b" has been removed as requested by the Examiner.

The specification has further been amended as requested by the Examiner to identify each respective section by its appropriate heading. Page 23, line 12 has been amended to identify the fins of the centre pin head by the reference no. 293, as is now illustrated in amended Figure 8B. In view of the above, the objections to the specification should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7, and 8 have been amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 1-8 remain in the application.

Reconsideration and allowance of these claims as now presented is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims Under 37 CFR §1.75

Claims 5 and 9 stand objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as being in improper form for being a multiple dependent claim that depends upon another multiple dependent claim. Claim 5 has been amended to depend solely upon Claim 1, while Claim 9 has been cancelled. As such, the claim objections under 37 CFR §1.75(c) should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng-Pei (U.S. 5,029,629). The Cheng-Pei '629 patent is generally directed to a curtain lift controller incorporating a brake mechanism. The Cheng-Pei '629 patent, however, does not teach or suggest the novel aspects of the present invention contained in the amended claims.

Specifically, the stop pin (621) on the spindle (6) of Cheng-Pei '629 does not cooperatively engage with correspondingly recesses in the sprocket support, as is presently claimed. Instead, the stop pin (621) engages with a cross hole (75) in circular cap (7) so as to prohibit relative rotation therebetween. However, no provision is described in Cheng-Pei '629 of one or more

fins on the centre pin that cooperatively engage with recesses in the sprocket support to prevent rotation as between the centre pin and the sprocket support.

Moreover, the Cheng-Pei '629 patent actually teaches away from the recitation in pending Claim 6 that the chain guard housing be rotatable with respect to the sprocket support member. Additionally, no teaching or suggestion is found in Cheng-Pei '629 of the chain guard housing lugs recited in independent Claim 7, nor the cross-sectional features of the claimed wrap spring in independent Claim 8. As such, the claim rejections based upon Cheng-Pei '629 should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims as now amended are believed to be unobvious and patentable over the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the presently amended claims are allowable on the merits. An early allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HAUGEN LAW FIRM PLLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark J. Burns', is written over the printed name.

Mark J. Burns, Reg. #46591
Attorney for Applicant
1130 TCF Tower
121 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: (612) 339-8300